



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/830,787	09/04/2001	Dietmar Huglin	HP/2-21867	3542
324 7590 12/10/2008 JoAnn Villamizar Ciba Corporation/Patent Department 540 White Plains Road P.O. Box 2005 Tarrytown, NY 10591			EXAMINER CHANNAVAJALA, LAKSHMI SARADA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1611	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/830,787

Applicant(s)

HUGLIN ET AL.

Examiner

Lakshmi S. Channavajjala

Art Unit

1611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 33, 35, 36, 42, 43, 47 and 48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33, 35, 36, 42, 43, 47 and 48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt of remarks dated 5-28-08 is acknowledged.

Claims 33, 35, 36, 42, 43 and 47-48 are pending in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

1. Claims 33, 35, 36, 42, 43, 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,643,985 to Hoffmann et al (Hoffmann) in view of US 5,242,689 to Yoshihara et al or vice-versa

Hoffmann teaches stabilization and prevention of oxidation of plastic materials of household or industrial type by the addition of phenolic antioxidants (col.1). The compounds (benzenepropanoic acid 3-(1,1-dimethylethyl)-4-hydroxy)-5-methyl-1,2-ethandiylbis(oxy-2,1-ethandiyl)ester & benzenepropanoic acid 3,5-bis-(1,1-dimethylethyl)-4-hydroxy)-1,6-hexanedylester) described in col. 6 of the Hoffmann meet the claimed compounds with the conditions of "e=2, Q= ethylene, v is O (for claims 33, 35, 36, 42-43). Hoffmann teaches mixtures of the compounds (see col. 3). While Hoffmann teaches the stabilizing compounds for recycled plastic materials (domestic as well as industrial- see col. 12 for lubricants, antistatic agents, pigments) and not body-care products, instant claims recite "body-care products". However, Hoffmann teaches the antioxidants for stabilizing recycled plastic materials that mainly comprise of polymers such as polystyrene, polyolefin etc (col. 1, L 18-25),

Yoshihara teaches cosmetic compositions comprising powdery organic substances such as polyethylene, polypropylene, polyvinyl chloride etc (col. 2, L 37-60, claim 2) and further suggests that the compositions further contains additives such as antioxidants (col. 3, L 41-53). Yoshihara does not teach the claimed phenolic antioxidants. It would have been obvious for one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention was made to employ the antioxidant phenolic compounds of Hoffmann to stabilize cosmetic compositions containing polymeric materials such as polyethylene, polypropylene, polyvinyl chloride of Yoshihara because Hoffmann suggests that the antioxidant compounds are effective in stabilizing the polymeric materials of plastic against thermoxidative degradation. A skilled artisan would have expected a stable cosmetic powder composition due to the presence of the antioxidants of Hoffmann.

2. Claims 33, 35 and 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable US 5,723,435 to Severns et al (Severns) in view of US 5,719,129 to Andary et al (Andary).

Severns states that the above antioxidant compounds demonstrate light stability and generally protect dyes from degradation by first preventing generation of singlet oxygen and peroxy radicals, thereafter terminating the degradation pathway (col. 4, L 43-53). In addition to the fabric care compounds such as fabric softeners, Severns also teaches incorporating sunscreen agents such as those described in col. 11 in the

compositions containing above antioxidants (the examples include Tinuvin 328, which is UV absorbing compound). Severns does not teach body care compositions.

Andary teaches that exposing to UV radiation; oxygen reduction is incomplete and results in the formation of free radicals that deteriorates phospholipids in cell membranes, resulting in various conditions such as aging, carcinogenesis etc (col. 3, L 25-36). Andary suggests incorporating a caffeic acid derivative, orapoxide, for trapping free radicals, and providing protection from UV A and UVB radiation (col. 3, 1-17). Thus, employing antioxidant compounds with sunscreen and free radical inhibiting effects are known in the art. Accordingly, it would have been obvious for one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention was made to employ the antioxidant phenolic compounds of Severns for their antioxidant activity not only in fabric softening compositions but also in cosmetic or pharmaceutical skin care composition such as Andary because Andaray suggests antioxidant compounds provide free radical inhibition and protect from ultraviolet radiation in sunlight (sunscreen). A skilled artisan would have expected the antioxidant compounds of Severns that also posses light stability to protect the skin from deterioration of phospholipids in cell membranes and thus inhibit various conditions such as aging, carcinogenesis etc.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9-2-08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claims 33, 35, 36, 42, 43, 47 and 48 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffmann, et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,643,985 in view of Yoshihara, U.S. Pat. No. 5,242,689.

Applicants argue that present claims are aimed at a method of preventing photo oxidation and auto oxidation processes in body-care products, for example skin powders, skin protection ointments, shampoos, etc. Applicants state that the phenolic antioxidants of Hoffmann have some overlap with those of the present claims. However they argue that the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to employ the antioxidant phenolic compounds of Hoffmann to stabilize the cosmetic compositions of Yoshihara, which constitutes hindsight analysis. It is argued that Hoffmann and Yoshihara are aimed at disparate arts (Hoffmann is aimed at plastics and Yoshihara is aimed at cosmetics) and are not properly combined.

Claims 33, 35, 47 and 48 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Severns, et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,723,435 in view of Andaray, et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,719,129.

Applicants argue that Severns is cited as teaching the stabilization of fabric care compositions with antioxidants. Applicants submit that this to combine these two references is hindsight analysis that Severns and Andaray are aimed at disparate arts and are not properly combined.

Applicants arguments filed 9-2-08 are considered but not found persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on

obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). In the instant situation, employing phenolic antioxidants as stabilizing is known in the prior art. Further, The Supreme Court in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. ___, ___, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1395-97 (2007) identified a number of rationales to support a conclusion of obviousness which are consistent with the proper "functional approach" to the determination of obviousness as laid down in *Graham*. Exemplary rationales that may support a conclusion of obviousness include: combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results; use of known technique to improve similar devices (methods, or products) in the same way; applying a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results; Known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one if the variations are predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art and finally, some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art that would have led one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention. Thus, the teachings of Hoffmann that the phenolic antioxidants may be used to stabilize plastic materials, which are also commonly used in body care products (Yoshihara), would lead one skilled in the art to employ such antioxidants in other compositions containing the

thermoplastic materials, including body care products of Yoshihara with a reasonable expectation to stabilize the thermoplastic materials of Yoshihara. Similarly, a skilled artisan would have reasonably expected that the phenolic compounds of Severns to exhibit their antioxidant activity not only in fabric softening compositions but also in cosmetic or pharmaceutical skin care composition such as Andaray because Andaray suggests antioxidant compounds provide free radical inhibition and protect from ultraviolet radiation in sunlight (sunscreen).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lakshmi S. Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-0591. The examiner can normally be reached on 9.00 AM -5.30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sharmila G. Landau can be reached on 571-272-0614. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lakshmi S Channavajjala/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1611
December 2, 2008